

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Official Action mailed **September 12, 2008**. Reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Status:

Claims 19-52 were withdrawn from consideration under the imposition of a previous Restriction Requirement and cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 2 was also cancelled previously without prejudice or disclaimer.

In the present paper, various claims have been amended as described below. Also, claims 1, 3-12, 53-61 and 73 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 13-18 and 62-72 are currently pending for further action.

Allowable Subject Matter:

In the recent Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 17 and 64-72. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the allowance of these claims.

The Examiner further indicated the presence of allowable subject matter in claims 13-16, 18, 62 and 63. Again, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this further identification of allowable subject matter.

In light of this finding of allowable subject matter, Applicant has decided to have these allowed and allowable claims issue as soon as possible. Therefore, the present paper retains only the allowed and allowable claims. Claims 13-16, 18, 62 and 63 have been amended into independent claims sets. All rejected claims have been cancelled.

Therefore, following entry of this amendment, the only remaining claims will be those allowed or indicated as allowable in the recent Office Action. Therefore, the application should be in condition for allowance.

Prior Art:

Claims 57 and 58 were rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or (e) by U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0134177 to Furuya (“Furuya”). This rejection is moot following the cancellation herein of the rejected claims.

Claims 1, 3-10, 12, 53-60 and 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combined teachings of Furuya, U.S. Patent No. 5,281,327 to Honda et al. (“Honda”), and U.S. Patent No. 6,059,943 to Murphy et al. (“Murphy”) with evidence from U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0071259 to Yoshida (“Yoshida”). This rejection is moot following the cancellation herein of the rejected claims.

Claims 11 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combined teachings of Furuya, Murphy, Honda with evidence from Yoshida and U.S. Patent No. 5,079,121 to Facci et al. This rejection is moot following the cancellation herein of the rejected claims.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing arguments, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. Therefore, this response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action. However, Applicants reserve the right to set forth further

arguments supporting the patentability of their claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers. Further, for any instances in which the Examiner took Official Notice in the Office Action, Applicants expressly do not acquiesce to the taking of Official Notice, and respectfully request that the Examiner provide an affidavit to support the Official Notice taken in the next Office Action, as required by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2) and MPEP § 2144.03.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: December 12, 2008

/Steven L. Nichols/

Steven L. Nichols

Registration No. 40,326

Steven L. Nichols, Esq.
Managing Partner, Utah Office
Rader Fishman & Grauer PLLC
River Park Corporate Center One
10653 S. River Front Parkway, Suite 150
South Jordan, Utah 84095
(801) 572-8066
(801) 572-7666 (fax)